



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/521,442	03/07/2000	Gopinathan K. Menon	SC35U-US	1007
60723	7590	10/22/2008	EXAMINER	
AVON PRODUCTS, INC. AVON PLACE SUFFERN, NY 10901			BARHAM, BETHANY P	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1615		
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		10/22/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATENT.DEPARTMENT@AVON.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/521,442	Applicant(s) MENON, GOPINATHAN K.
	Examiner BETHANY BARHAM	Art Unit 1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 36,38-40,42-44,46-48 and 50-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 36,38-40,42-44,46-48 and 50-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date, _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Summary

Receipt of Applicant's Remarks and Claim Amendments filed on 08/21/08 is acknowledged. Claims 36, 38-40, 42-44, 46-48 and 50-54 are pending. Claims 36, 38-40, 42-44, 46-48 and 50-54 are rejected.

MAINTAINED REJECTIONS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 36, 38-40, 42-44, 46-48 and 50-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. How to make the composition is not taught in the instant specification and as no correlation exists between *in vivo* and *in vitro*; the instant specification only provides written description for perilla oil used in treating cells. The results are not commensurate with the scope of the instant claims, as the specification teaches that perilla oil must be 'aged' or 'stored' prior

to obtaining PPAR activity (pg. 6, lines 7-13). The art US 5,312,834 teaches a composition of perilla oil for treating the skin with this function that should have the same activity, but the instant specification teaches that it does not. As such the claims lack written description.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 36-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. Evidence that claim 36-51 fail to correspond in scope with that which applicant regard as the invention can be found in the specification filed 3/7/2000. In that paper, applicant has stated (pg. 6, lines 7-13) that "It is surprising and unexpected that perilla oil inhibits up regulation by PPAR agonists, as perilla oil itself contains PPAR agonists such as linolenic acid and linoleic acid. This may be attributable to perilla oil undergoing oxidation on storage due to the high content of unsaturated fatty acids. The oxidation process may alter the PPAR stimulating activity of linolenic acid and linoleic acid...", and this statement indicates that the invention is different from what is defined in the claim(s) because the instant claims do not require that perilla oil is 'aged' or stored for a certain amount of time prior to application on the cellulite. The instant claims suggest instead that fresh perilla oil treats cellulite. This is not what the instant specification teaches and as such there is a failure to claim the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 35-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,945,109 ('109) in view of US 5,312,834 ('834).

The '109 patent teaches the limitations of claims 35-51 with the exception of using perilla oil:

- '109 teaches a cosmetic product for topical administration for cellulite (abstract).
'109 teaches that the cosmetic product comprises a topical application of an ointment, gel, cream, etc and that formulations include essential oils and plant extracts (col. 5, lines 31-54).
- '109 teaches that the product is topically applied once to twice daily (col. 6, lines 6-25).
- '109 example 1 teaches a groundnut oil added at 10% by weight to a cellulite cream.
- '109 does not teach perilla oil, but does teach essentials oils and plant extracts.
- '834 teaches that various creams and ointments for the skin contain chemicals that cause severe allergic reactions and can complicate skin problems (col. 1,

lines 13-24 and col. 3, lines 17-28) and that a composition comprising perilla oil which has no side effects effectively treats skin and provides for good color and resilience of skin (col. 3, lines 41-47 and col. 5, lines 63-67). Examples teach that the perilla oil is from perilla seed of *Perilla frutescens* var. Further, '834 teaches that the 'aesthetic' appearance of skin is improved over time (Examples).

A reference is analyzed using its broadest teachings. MPEP 2123 [R-5].

"[W]hen a patent simply arranges old elements with each performing the same function it had been known to perform and yields no more than one would expect from such an arrangement, the combination is obvious". KSR v. Teleflex, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740 (2007)(quoting Sakraida v. A.G. Pro, 425 U.S. 273, 282 (1976). "[W]hen the question is whether a patent claiming the combination of elements of prior art is obvious", the relevant question is "whether the improvement is more than the predictable use of prior art elements according to their established functions." (Id.). Addressing the issue of obviousness, the Supreme Court noted that the analysis under 35 USC 103 "need not seek out precise teachings directed to the specific subject matter of the challenged claim, for a court can take account of the inferences and creative steps that a person of ordinary skill in the art would employ." KSR v. Teleflex, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007). The Court emphasized that "[a] person of ordinary skill is... a person of ordinary creativity, not an automaton." Id. at 1742.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine '109 in view of '834. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of '109 and '834, since many people are

known to have allergic reactions as taught by '834 and '834 teaches that perilla oil is safe and has no side effects. '109 teaches a topical cream for the treatment of cellulite that includes plant oils, while '834 teaches perilla oil is specifically beneficial to healing skin conditions and inflammation to yield resilient and good colored skin. One would have a reasonable expectation of success in substituting a safe plant oil such as perilla oil of '834 which has no known side effects for groundnut oil of '109 to obtain the composition of '109 in view of '834.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 36, 38-40, 42-44, 46-48 and 50-54 have been considered but are not persuasive. Applicant's argue that the Examiner erroneously concludes that the perilla oil must be aged or stored and that instead their invention is directed to fresh unaged perilla oil. The Examiner respectfully points out that there is no proof in the instant specification that the perilla oil isn't aged in the Examples and further the instant specification appears to speculate that aging the oil is the reason for its unexpected properties. Silence of the instant examples about the age of the perilla oil is not a teaching away from use of aged perilla oil. Further, there still exists another written description issue in that there is no correlation between *in vivo* and *in vitro* results and the instant specification only describes treating cells with the composition, not topical application onto the skin as is instant claimed. The use of '834 as a reference is to show that Applicant claims that prior art does not recognize perilla oil to treat skin impurities (instant specification pg. 3, lines 1-10), when in fact '834 does

teach perilla oil treat skin impurities and that the composition also contains fish oil is not a teaching away from the instant claims which have the open 'comprising' language (abstract, Examples). As such the 112 rejections are maintained.

Applicant's argue that there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness and no motivation to combine '109 and '834, and the examiner respectfully points out that applicant's argue against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

It should be noted that the motivation to combine references can be different from the ones set forth by Applicant. That is, as long as motivation exists to combine the elements, the problem to be solved does not have to involve the same reason for making the anti-cellulite cream of '109 with the perilla oil of '834. As such, the examiner respectfully submits that there is motivation to combine the teachings of '109 in view of '834 and the expected result of topical cream for treating cellulite comprising perilla oil. '109 teaches the composition for topical administration via cream, ointment, etc for treatment of cellulite comprising essential oils and plant extracts, '834 teaches that various creams and ointments for the skin contain chemicals that cause severe allergic reactions and can further complicate skin problems, but that perilla oil is safe and effective for treating skin impurities to improve 'aesthetic' appearance of skin (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 3, lines 41-47 and col. 5, lines 63-67); as such as skilled artisan who is not an automaton would know how to substitute one plant oil (groundnut) for another

Art Unit: 1615

(perilla of '834), especially since perilla oil is taught to be safe, and not cause allergic reactions. Applicant also argues that Examiner has not provided proof that groundnut oil causes allergies, however the '834 teaches that cream, ointments, etc for treating skin inflammation often cause skin allergies and complicate the skin problem, but that perilla oil overcomes this. As such there is no need for a reference proving groundnut oil causes an allergic reaction, but rather that perilla oil itself does not cause any such reaction, however, please see cited as interest (below) for proof that a skilled artisan would know that peanut oil causes allergic reactions.

CITED AS INTEREST

Olszewski et al (1998) teaches that peanut oil contains allergenic proteins in both crude and refined peanut oil (abstract and conclusion pg. 858) and that peanut oil has been responsible for deaths (intro. 2nd column pg. 850).

Moneret-Vautrin et al (1998) teaches that the role of residual allergenic proteins in peanut oil is established by positive skin prick tests to proteic extracts from peanut oil and by double-blind placebo controlled challenges to peanut oil and that the presence of peanut oil allergens can contribute to the occurrence or persistence of symptoms (Summary pg. 1113). The art also teaches that avoidance of peanut oil is recommended and that creams and ointments containing peanut oil are not recommended (discussion pg. 1118).

Conclusions

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bethany Barham whose telephone number is (571)272-6175. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward can be reached on 571-272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Bethany Barham
Art Unit 1615

/Michael P Woodward/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1615